

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 27, 2004 in which the Examiner made certain technical objections to the specification claims and drawings.

The Examiner indicated that claims 1-24 are allowed.

Claims 25 and 26 are rejected as allegedly non-enabling. According to the Examiner, claim 1 recites that the center of gravity and center of lift are substantially vertically aligned. However, the Examiner asserts that claim 25 recites that the center of lift moves sharply rearward. Thus, according to the Examiner it is not clear how both conditions can exist at the same time. Claim 26 recites that the center of lift moves sharply forward and the Examiner rejects the claim for the same reason.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the shape of the wetted hull is substantially rectangular. This language is in compliance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly it is believed that the drawing objection has been obviated by this Amendment.

Claim 17 has been made dependent from claim 13, which is the first occurrence of "a rear flap means".

With respect to claims 25 and 26 it is believed that Figure 7 fully illustrates the particular shape of the hull which allows the requirements of the claims to be met. It is true that the centers of gravity of lift cannot meet the requirements of claims 1 and either 25 or 26 at the same time. However, this is not what the claims recite. Claims 25 and 26 require the

hydrodynamic center of lift to move sharply forwards or rearwards under pitch conditions (this is an example of dynamic stability), whereas the requirements of claim 1 are applicable solely when the hull is traveling at the lift off speed and at the designed speed, i.e., at steady state conditions. This is mentioned specifically in claim 1.

It is feasible for a hull to be shaped, as shown in the example of figure 7, such that when the craft pitches, the bow of the craft raises, the center of lift moves rearwards (claim 25), or when the craft lowers, the center of lift moves sharply forward as in claim 26.

Therefore, it is apparent that the hull can be shaped such that it meets the requirements of claims 1, 25 and 26, even though the specified arrangements of the centers of lift and pressure cannot be achieved at the same time. The claims do not suggest that the requirements should be met at the same time, but that the requirements should be met when different conditions are imposed on the hull.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner consider the rejection of these claims and pass the application to issue.


Appln. No.: 09/936,089  
Docket No.: 66347-064-2  
Amdt. Dated: Mar. 7, 05  
Reply to Office action of Oct. 27, 04

If any further objections remain, it is requested that the Examiner  
contact the undersigned so that such issues may be promptly resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:



John P. DeLuca  
Registration No. 25,505  
Franklin Square, Third Floor West  
1300 I Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3353  
(202) 906-8600

DC01\90010.1  
ID\JPD